



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/785,861	02/16/2001	Gregory M. Burgess	50037.24US01	5183
27488	7590	12/03/2004		
MICROSOFT CORPORATION C/O MERCHANT & GOULD, L.L.C. P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			EXAMINER CHANKONG, DOHM	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2152	

DATE MAILED: 12/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/785,861

Applicant(s)

BURGESS, GREGORY M.

Examiner

Dohm Chankong

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1> Applicant's amendment and remarks have been received and reviewed. Claims 1-30 are still presented for examination.

Claim Objections

2> Applicant has not amended claims 16 and 30 as stated in the remarks. Therefore, claims 16 and 30 are still objected to because they are incomplete sentences. Appropriate correction is required.

Response to Arguments

3> Applicant's arguments filed 8.27.2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In regards to the rejections of claims 1-9, Applicant is arguing in substance (a) Aravamudhan does not disclose translating properties from a first format to a second format, and (b) Aravamudhan does not disclose that the second format is consistent with an underlying storage mechanism of a mobile device.

With respect to (a), Applicant argues that Aravamudhan providing normalized data and does not teach translation of a property. Examiner would like to direct Applicant's attention to Aravamudhan [column 7 «lines 7-45» | claim 1]. The aspect of the invention to which Applicant refers in his remarks is only part of Aravamudhan's invention. Aravamudhan does indeed disclose converting (translating) data from a network protocol format to a normalized standard format for easy storage. He further discloses that the

normalized data is converted back to the data format consistent with the mobile device.

Therefore, Aravamudhan clearly discloses the limitation as claimed.

With respect to (b), Aravamudhan discloses converting normalized data to network protocol data consistent with the mobile device [column 8 «lines 60-65» | column 12 «lines 9-12»].

In light of the foregoing, Aravamudhan clearly anticipates the limitations as claimed.

In regards to claims 10-21, Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendment.

In regards to claims 22-30, Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but moot in view of the new grounds of rejection. In addition, with respect to claim 22, Applicant argues that Guck's message contents are not analogous to the claimed message property and that Guck does not disclose receiving a request to retrieve said property.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's assertion. Guck discloses representing a document's contents as properties and transforming a document's contents into a second format consistent with the requesting device [column 8 «lines 28-30»]. Furthermore, Examiner believes that a document's contents can be interpreted as being a property of the document as there is no language found in Applicant's claims that suggest the exclusion of a document's content from being considered as a message or document property. And Guck also discloses a "get" request command to retrieve a document's contents from a database [column 9 «lines 10-24»]. As mentioned previously, the message contents are in the form of a property of the message and therefore is equivalent in functionality to the claimed

Art Unit: 2152

message property of the present invention. Therefore, Examiner believes that Guck does disclose the limitations as claimed.

In conclusion, Examiner maintains the 35 U.S.C § 102(e) rejections of claims 1-9 and presents new grounds of rejections for claims 10-30, necessitated by Applicant's amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4> The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5> Claims 1, 2, 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(e) as being anticipated by Aravamudhan et al (hereinafter Aravamudhan), U.S Patent No. 6,563,919.

6> As to claim 1, Aravamudhan teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable components for receiving and distributing a message within a mobile device (abstract), comprising:

a storage component in communication with at least one messaging component and a data store, wherein the messaging component communicates with the storage component by passing properties of a message to the storage component in a first format, and wherein the storage component is configured to translate the properties from the first format to a second format and to pass the translated properties to the data store, wherein the second format is consistent with an underlying storage mechanism of the mobile device (Figure 5, column 4, lines 45-60, column 6, line 11 to column 7, line 45, column 8, lines 60-65 and claims 1 and 2 where: the UDS is analogous to the storage component, the UMM analogous to the messaging component and the cluster of gateways is analogous to the data store).

7> As to claim 2, Aravamudhan teaches a computer-implemented medium, wherein the messaging component comprises a mail application (column 3, line 18-24 and column 7, lines 14-45).

8> As to claim 4, Aravamudhan teaches a computer-implemented medium, wherein the messaging component comprises a message transport (column 10, lines 6-10 and claim 1).

9> As to claim 5, Aravamudhan teaches a computer-implemented medium further comprising another messaging component that communicates with the at least one

Art Unit: 2152

messaging component and the storage component using the first format (column 7, lines 7-45 and column 8, line 66 to column 10, line 16).

10> As to claim 6, Aravamudhan teaches a computer-implemented medium wherein the storage component further comprises at least one handler configured to perform the translation of the properties from the first format to the second format (column 6, lines 61-62 and column 7, lines 27-45).

11> As to claim 7, Aravamudhan teaches a computer-implemented medium wherein the handler is registered to translate a particular type of property, and wherein the storage component is makes use of the handler if a property of the message corresponds to the particular type of property (column 9, lines 23-40 – wherein the property that triggers the translation of the message is the format of said message).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12> The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2152

13> Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aravamudhan as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Kennedy (hereinafter Kennedy), U.S Patent No.

6,134,582..

14> Aravamudhan teaches a computer-implemented medium with a messaging component but does not teach the messaging component comprising a message form.

15> Kennedy teaches a computer-implemented medium, wherein the messaging component comprises a message form (column 9, lines 50-63 and column 11, lines 23-41). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Aravamudhan's messaging component to include a message form to more efficiently organize the message data into fields.

16> Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aravamudhan as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, in view of Buckley et al (hereinafter Buckley) U.S Patent No. 6,035,327.

17> Buckley was cited by applicant in IDS #5, from March 1, 2004.

18> As to claim 8 and 9, Aravamudhan does not specifically teach a computer implemented medium wherein the handler is further configured to create a new property from a property passed to the storage component.

19> Buckley teaches a computer-implemented medium wherein the handler is further configured to create a new property from a property passed to the storage component (column 10, lines 47-62). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the property creation functionality into Aravamudhan's handler to handle any properties of the messages being sent to the data store.

20> Claims 10-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aravamudhan, in view of Guck, U.S Patent No. 5,848,415.

21> As to claim 10, Aravamudhan discloses a computer-implemented medium having computer executable-instructions for performing steps, comprising:

receiving a request, the request being in a first format, the data store being configured to store data in a second format, the request including data associated with the property (Figure 5 | column 4, lines 60-67 where: the UDS is analogous to the data store, the original mobile communication protocol analogous to the first format, the normalized data stored in the UDS analogous to the second format);

translating the data associated with the property from the first format into the second format (column 11, line 65 to column 12, line 2); and

storing the data in the data store in the second format (column 11, lines 59-63 and claim 2).

Aravamudhan does disclose storing message data [column 14 «lines 27-34»] but does not explicitly disclose a request to store a property of a message within a data store.

22> Guck discloses receiving a request to store a property of a message within a data store [column 4 «lines 3-33» | column 8 «lines 43-48» where: Guck's submission of a source document is analogous to the request]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement Aravamudhan's request as Guck's storage request for storing a message property into the database. As Aravamudhan suggests storing message data (properties) in a database, one would have been motivated to perform such an implementation to allow users in Aravamudhan's system the means to control which messages are stored in the database

23> As to claim 11, Aravamudhan discloses the computer-readable medium of claim 10, wherein the property includes a descriptor that distinguishes the property from other properties (Figure 4, item 50 and column 8, lines 10-23 where: the names of the normalized data (such as AAV, AuthCap) for each network personality is analogous to the descriptor).

24> As to claim 12, Aravamudhan discloses the computer-readable medium of claim 11, wherein the descriptor comprises a property type (column 8, lines 10-54).

25> As to claim 13, Aravamudhan discloses a computer-readable medium wherein translating the data comprises passing the data to a handler for processing, the handler being

Art Unit: 2152

associated with the descriptor (column 4, line 45 to column 5, line 7, column 6, lines 61-62 and column 7, lines 40-42).

26> As to claim 14, Aravamudhan discloses a computer-readable medium wherein the handler is registered to process data of a type associated with the descriptor (column 6, lines 61-62 and column 7, line 66 to column 8, line 44).

27> As to claim 15, Aravamudhan discloses a computer-readable medium wherein the handler is further configured to convert the property from the first format into the second format (Figure 5 and column 4, lines 51-67).

28> As to claim 16, Aravamudhan discloses a computer-readable medium, wherein the handler is further configured to translate the property into at least one other property, the at least one other property conforming to the second format (Figure 5, column 4, lines 51-67 and column 7, lines 7-45).

29> As to claim 17, Aravamudhan discloses a computer-readable medium wherein storing the data in the data store comprises storing the data in a plurality of tables (Figure 4 and column 8, lines 55-65).

30> As to claim 19, Aravamudhan discloses a computer-readable medium wherein one of the plurality of tables is configured to contain certain properties, and another one of the

plurality of tables is configured to contain certain other properties (Figure 4, column 4, lines 3-10 and 55-65 where: one of the tables is configured to contain categories and properties of network personality, while another table is configured for a different network personality).

31> Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aravamudhan and Guck as applied to claim 10 and 17 above, in view of Thurlow et al (hereinafter Thurlow), U.S Patent No. 6,057,841.

32> Thurlow was disclosed by Applicant in IDS #5, dated March 1, 2004 .

33> Aravamudhan does not teach a computer-readable medium wherein each of the plurality of tables corresponds to a message folder.

34> Thurlow teaches a computer-readable medium wherein each of the plurality of tables corresponds to a message folder (Figure 3, column 7, lines 29-58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Aravamudhan's plurality of tables to sync with corresponding message folders so users can utilize a summary view of the messages, allowing clearer and more precise viewing.

35> Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being patentable over Aravamudhan and Guck as applied to claims 10 and 17 above, in view of Peters et al (hereinafter Peters), U.S Patent No. 6,292,795.

36> As to claim 20, Aravamudhan does not teach a computer-readable medium wherein a table within the plurality of tables is configured as an overflow mechanism for another of the tables within the plurality of tables.

37> Peters teaches a computer-readable medium wherein a table within the plurality of tables is configured as an overflow mechanism for another of the tables within the plurality of tables (column 4, line 51 to column 5, lines 40-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement an overflow table in Aravamudhan to manage any extra data from messages whenever the other tables are filled to their maximum data capacity.

38> As to claim 21, Aravamudhan does not teach a computer-readable medium wherein the overflow mechanism comprises a file system.

39> Peters teaches a computer-readable medium wherein the overflow mechanism comprises a file system (column 5, lines 3-10 where the directory is the file system). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Aravamudhan's overflow mechanism to utilize a file system to make it easier to organize, store and sort the information contained in the overflow mechanism.

Art Unit: 2152

40> Claims 22, 23 and 25-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by Guck, in view of Aravamudhan.

41> As to claim 22 Guck teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing steps, comprising:

receiving a request to retrieve a property of a message from a data store, the request being in a first format, the data store being configured to store data in a second format (column 4, lines 52-55, column 6, lines 25-33, column 7, lines 27-33 and 49-56, column 9, lines 10-24 and column 11, lines 48-55);

retrieving the data from the data store in a second format (column 5, lines 1-9); and translating the data associated with the property from the second format into the first format (column 4, lines 55-65).

Guck does disclose that the second format is consistent with an underlying storage format of a device [column 4 «lines 3-23 and 35-47» | claim 1] but does not specifically disclose that the device is a mobile device.

42> Aravamudhan discloses storing data in a format that is consistent with an underlying storage format of a mobile device [abstract | Figure 5 | claim 1]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Aravamudhan's mobile device functionality into Guck's data conversion system in addition to Guck's other devices. One would have been motivated to perform such an implementation for the obtained advantage of implementing mobile devices into Guck, increasing Guck's data translation capabilities

43> As to claim 23, Guck teaches a computer-readable medium further comprising passing the translated data to a component associated with the request (column 11, lines 24-33).

44> As to claim 25, Guck teaches a computer-readable medium wherein the property includes a descriptor that distinguishes the property from other properties (column 12, lines 14-15 where the parameter of the file is the descriptor [image/tiff, image/jpeg]).

45> As to claim 26, Guck teaches a computer-readable medium wherein the descriptor comprises a property type (column 12, lines 14-15).

46> As to claim 27, Guck teaches a computer-readable medium wherein translating the data comprises passing the data to a handler for processing, the handler being associated with the descriptor (column 4, lines 48-62).

47> As to claim 28, Guck teaches a computer-readable medium wherein the handler is registered to process data of a type associated with the descriptor (Figure 5 and column 12, lines 43-54).

48> As to claim 29, Guck teaches a computer-readable medium wherein the handler is further configured to convert the property from the first format into the second format (Figure 5 and column 12, lines 43-54).

49> As to claim 30, Guck teaches a computer-readable medium wherein the handler is further configured to translate the property into at least one other property, the at least one other property conforming to the second format (Figures 6, 7 and column 12, lines 10-27).

50> Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guck and Aravamudhan, as applied to claim 22 above, in further view of Segur, U.S. Patent No. 6,212,550.

51> Guck teaches a computer-readable medium wherein the data is retrieved from a table (column 4, lines 3-23).

52> Guck does not teach retrieving from at least one table in a plurality of tables. Segur discloses a database that can store information in a plurality of tables [Figure 4 | column 3 «lines 3-23»]. It would have been obvious one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a plurality of tables in Guck's database to increase the storage efficiency and capacity for storing data as well as providing more efficient conversion means as taught by Segur.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dohm Chankong whose telephone number is (571)272-3942. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (571)272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2152

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DC



ZARNI MAUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER